arXiv:1402.4362v1 [astro-ph.SR] 18 Feb 2014

Problems with neutrino-driven core-collapse supernova mechanisms

Oded Papish[1] Jason Nordhaus[2]and Noam Soker[1]

ABSTRACT

We study the typical time-scale and energy for accelerating gas by neutrinos in core-collapse supernovae (CCSNe), and find the explosion energy of the delayed-neutrino mechanism to be an order of magnitude below the required $E_{\rm exp} \gtrsim 10^{51}$ erg $\equiv 1$ foe. When the recombination of free nucleons to α-particles is considered, under the most favorable conditions, the energy of the ejected mass can be ~ 0.5 foe. Using typical values of mass in the gain region, neutrino fluxes, and recent results from different groups, we argue that combining neutrino heating and recombination energy more likely gives < 0.5 foe. Our results and the recent failure of different three-dimensional numerical simulations to achieve robust explosions with the observed energies, call for a paradigm shift and investigation of alternatives to the delayed-neutrino mechanism.

1. INTRODUCTION

Eighty years after Baade & Zwicky (1934) first suggested that supernovae (SNe) are powered by stars collapsing into neutron stars (NS), the processes by which part of this gravitational energy is channelled to explosion remains controversial. Wilson (1985) and Bethe & Wilson (1985) refined the neutrino mechanism (Colgate & White 1966) into the delayed-neutrino mechanism, whereby neutrinos emitted within a period of ~ 1 s after the bounce of the collapsed core heat material in the gain region ($r \approx 100 - 200$ km). This subsequent neutrino-heating was thought to revive the stalled shock thereby exploding the star and producing a canonical core-collapse supernova (CCSN) with an observed energy of $E_{\rm exp} \gtrsim 1$ foe, where 1 foe $\equiv 10^{51}$ erg.

In the last three decades, sophisticated multidimensional simulations with increasing capabilities were used to study the delayed-neutrino mechanism (e.g., Bethe & Wilson 1985; Burrows & Lattimer 1985; Burrows et al. 1995; Fryer & Warren 2002; Buras et al. 2003; Ott et al. 2008; Marek & Janka

[1]Department of Physics, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel; papish@physics.technion.ac.il; soker@physics.technion.ac.il

[2]NSF Astronomy and Astrophysics Fellow, Department of Mathematics, Center for Computational Relativity and Gravitation, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, USA; nordhaus@astro.rit.edu

2009; Nordhaus et al. 2010; Brandt et al. 2011; Hanke et al. 2012; Kuroda et al. 2012; Hanke et al. 2012; Mueller et al. 2012; Bruenn et al. 2013; Mueller & Janka 2014). The outcome of such numerical experiments varied widely with many failing to revive the stalled shock while others produced tepid explosions with energies less than 1 foe. Historically, in spherically symmetric calculations (1D), the vast majority of progenitors can not even explode (Burrows et al. 1995; Rampp & Janka 2000; Mezzacappa et al. 2001; Liebendörfer et al. 2005). The exception being the 8.8-$M_\odot$ progenitor of Nomoto & Hashimoto (1988) which resulted in a $\sim 3\times10^{49}$ erg neutrino-driven-wind explosion due to the rarified stellar envelope (Kitaura et al. 2006). Extension to axisymmetric calculations (2D) yielded similar outcomes over their 1D counterparts despite the inclusion of instabilities such as neutrino-driven convection and the standing-accretion-shock instability (SASI) (Burrows et al. 1995; Janka & Mueller 1996; Buras et al. 2006a,b; Ott et al. 2008; Marek & Janka 2009). It should be noted that while many of the current numerical experiments incorporate multi-dimensional hydrodynamics, performing 3D radiation is currently prohibitive computationally (Zhang et al. 2013). Many groups utilize multi-group-flux-limited diffusion (MGFLD) in the 1D "ray-by-ray" transport approximation. This is a reasonable approach to core-collapse simulations both because of the limitation of current computational resources and because the results for multi-angle transport are similar to those for MGFLD except in the cases of extremely rapid rotation (Ott et al. 2008). Thus, it's unlikely that future simulations that incorporate 3D transport will yield fundamental differences over current state-of-the-art calculations in terms of the viability of neutrino mechanism.

Recently, a number of groups have published 3D core-collapse simulations with differing computational approaches and various levels of sophistication (Nordhaus et al. 2010; Janka 2013; Couch 2013; Takiwaki et al. 2013; Dolence et al. 2013; Hanke et al. 2012, 2013; Couch & O'Connor 2013). Some groups find that the extra-degree of freedom available in 3D simulations makes it easier to achieve shock revival over their axisymmetric counterparts (Nordhaus et al. 2010; Dolence et al. 2013). On the other hand, several groups have found the opposite; namely that explosions are harder to achieve in 3D than 2D (Janka 2013; Couch 2013; Takiwaki et al. 2013; Hanke et al. 2012, 2013; Couch & O'Connor 2013). If that's the case, then it may well be that the delayed-neutrino mechanism categorically fails and alternative mechanisms should be investigated.

In one recent case, axisymmetric calculations of 12-, 15-, 20-, and 25-$M_\odot$ progenitors successfully revived the shock with explosion energy estimates of $\sim 0.1-0.7\,\mathrm{foe}$ (Bruenn et al. 2013). However, we find that the increase of energy with time in their simulations fits an explosion by a continuous wind and also explains why their progenitors explode at the same time though more details of their simulations are required to fully capture the exploding agent. Winds were suggested to power CCSN in the past (e.g., Burrows & Goshy 1993; Burrows et al. 1995), but were found to have limited contribution to the explosion for a more massive than $8.8M_\odot$ starts. Many CCSNe, e.g., some recent Type Ic SNe (Roy et al. 2013; Takaki et al. 2013) explode with kinetic energy

of $\gtrsim 10$ foe. Neutrino based mechanisms cannot account for such energies even under favorable conditions. For example, Ugliano et al. (2012) performed a set of simulations where the energy was artificially scaled to that of SN 1987A, and found that even if neutrino explosions do work for some CCSNe, no explosions with kinetic energy of > 2 foe are achieved.

The delayed-neutrino mechanism must be shown to produce robust explosions with canonical supernova energies for a range of progenitors if it is to continue to be a contender in core-collapse theory. Despite decades of effort with the most sophisticated physics to date, no current simulation has produced a successful 10^{51} erg supernova. It is this fact that leads us to argue that the delayed-neutrino mechanism has a generic character that prevents it from exploding the star with an observed energy of 1 foe.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In section 2 we summarize the findings of some current numerical core-collapse studies. In section 3, we expand upon the argument presented in Papish & Soker (2012a) that the delayed-neutrino mechanism cannot achieve canonical supernova energies. We consider the limitation of the delayed-neutrino mechanism from another perspective in section 4. In section 5 we discuss the role of progenitor perturbations and why contradicting results are common among the groups simulating neutrino-based mechanisms, and in section 6 we discuss the energy available from recombination of free nucleons. Our short discussion and summary are in section 7.

2. SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

The outcomes of some of the most recent numerical simulation studies (2010 and beyond) are listed in Table 1 in two sections. The upper section contains realistic and relevant radiation-hydrodynamic core-collapse simulations that utilize sophisticated neutrino-transport algorithms. The lower section details simulation set-ups that include parameterized or artificially scaled neutrino heating and cooling algorithms and should be taken with a grain of salt. We did not include all recent simulations in Table 1. For example, we did not include the calculations of Sawai & Yamada (2014) who include rapid rotation and magnetic fields to aid neutrino heating, but their diagnostic explosion energy reaches only $\sim 10^{49}$ erg. What is clear is that for over the last two decades, none of the realistic simulations achieve 1 foe explosion energies and many of the results are often inconsistent and sometimes contradictory.

The delicate and problematic nature of neutrino-driven mechanisms were already revealed with 1D simulations, such that even the most sophisticated neutrino transport calculations were unable to explode stars for progenitor masses $\gtrsim 12 M_{\odot}$ (e.g., Liebendörfer et al. 2001). Multidimensional effects were then seen as necessary for triggering an explosion. The most common

multi-dimensional processes that have been studied as a rescue for the delayed-neutrino mechanism were neutrino-driven convection (e.g., Burrows et al. 1995) and hydrodynamic instabilities, such as the SASI (Blondin et al. 2003). These axisymmetic (2D) simulations have shown mixed and contradicting results. Most do not get an 'explosion' at all, while others obtain explosions with very little energy, i.e., $\ll 1$ foe (e.g., Suwa 2013; Suwa et al. 2010). In most of these cases where an 'explosion' is claimed, it is actually only shock revival and not a typical explosion, as the energy is much too low to explain most observed CCSNe.

In the past few years, the regime of 3D flow structures have been explored in more detail (e. g. Nordhaus et al. 2010). The simulations have not reached any consensus on the outcome. While some show that it is harder to revive the shock in 3D than in 2D, other showed the opposite (see Table 1 and section 1). Even in 3D simulations that successfully revive the shock, the energy is significantly lower than 1 foe. We now discuss the nature of neutrino-driven mechanisms, which we argue can account for the characteristics of the results in Table 1.

3. TIME-SCALE CONSIDERATIONS

We start with simple time-scale considerations during the revival of the shock in a spherically symmetric outflow. The "gain region" of the delayed neutrino mechanism, i. e. where neutrino heating outweighs neutrino cooling, typically occurs in the region $r \simeq 100 - 400$ km (Janka 2001). If energy becomes significant the gas will be accelerated and escape within a time of

$$t_{\rm esc} \simeq \frac{r}{0.5 v_{\rm esc}(r)} = 3.28 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{r}{100\ {\rm km}}\right)^{3/2}\ {\rm s}. \quad (1)$$

where we have assumed a mass of $1.4 M_\odot$ neutron star. The neutrino "optical depth" from r to infinity is given by

$$\tau_\nu \simeq (r/100\ {\rm km})^{-3} \quad (2)$$

(Janka 2001), where the typical electron neutrino luminosity is $L_\nu \simeq L_{\bar\nu} \simeq 5 \times 10^{52}\ {\rm erg\ s^{-1}}$ (e.g., Mueller et al. 2012). Over all, if the interaction occurs near a radius r in the gain region, the energy that can be acquired by the expanding gas is

$$E_{\rm shell} \simeq t_{\rm esc} \tau L_\nu = \frac{2r}{v_{\rm esc}(r)} \tau L_\nu \simeq 0.16 \left(\frac{r}{100\ {\rm km}}\right)^{-1.5} \left(\frac{L_\nu}{5 \times 10^{52}\ {\rm erg\ s^{-1}}}\right)\ {\rm foe}. \quad (3)$$

This simple estimate leads us to conclude that the total energy that can be used to revive the shock is limited to a typical value of $\sim 2 \times 10^{50}\ {\rm erg} = 0.2$ foe. Using a more typical radius of ~ 200 km for the acceleration region, reduces the total energy to 0.05 foe. Non-spherical flows that allow some simultaneous inflow-outflow structure, might under favorable conditions be expected

to increase the energy by a factor of few to $\sim 0.1 - 0.3$ foe. This is consistent with numerical simulation results of the delayed neutrino mechanism given in Table 1.

4. ENERGY CONSIDERATIONS

We examine the situation by considering in more detail the acceleration from the delayed-neutrino mechanism. Consider a mass M_a that is accelerated and ejected by absorbing a fraction f of the neutrino energy. The mass starts at radius r_0 with zero energy. Namely the sum of internal and gravitational energy is zero. This is an optimistic assumption, as the internal energy itself also needs to be supplied by neutrinos. Neutrino losses can be absorbed into the parameter f. After an acceleration time t the energy of the mass is $fL_\nu t$ and its velocity is

$$v = \frac{dr}{dt} \simeq \left(\frac{2fL_\nu t}{M_a}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{4}$$

Let the acceleration be effective to radius r_a at time t_a. Integrating over time gives

$$r_a - r_0 \simeq \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{2fL_\nu}{M_a}\right)^{1/2} t_a^{3/2}, \tag{5}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} t_a &\simeq \left(\tfrac{9}{8}\right)^{1/3} (r_a - r_0)^{2/3} \left(\tfrac{M_a}{fL_\nu}\right)^{1/3} \\ &= 0.05 \left(\tfrac{r_e - r_0}{500\ \mathrm{km}}\right)^{2/3} \left(\tfrac{M_a}{0.1 M_\odot}\right)^{1/3} \left(\tfrac{L_\nu}{5\times 10^{52}\ \mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}}}\right)^{-1/3} \left(\tfrac{f}{0.1}\right)^{-1/3}\ \mathrm{s}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Under these assumptions, the energy of the ejected mass is

$$E_a \simeq t_a f L_\nu \simeq 0.24 \left(\frac{r_e - r_0}{500\ \mathrm{km}}\right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{M_a}{0.1 M_\odot}\right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{L_\nu}{5\times 10^{52}\ \mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}}}\right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{f}{0.1}\right)^{2/3} \mathrm{foe}. \tag{7}$$

More typical values for acceleration over $\sim$500 km are $f < 0.1$ due to the low neutrino opacity (eq. 2), and lower accelerated mass. These values give $E_a < 0.2$ foe as in Equation 3.

5. THE ALMOST UNBOUND STALLED SHOCK

The energy of the immediately post-shocked gas falling from thousands of km to hundreds of km is close to zero before there is much neutrino cooling. Whether the shocked gas falls or expands is a question of whether a small amount of energy is added to revive the shock. When there are

departures from spherical symmetry, like the perturbations introduced by Couch & Ott (2013) or instabilities in the post-shock region, in some areas the extra energy comes at the expense of other areas. For example, a vortex can add a positive velocity in the region of the flow where the flow goes out. Even if the shock is revived, the energy limitations given in Sections 3 and 4 apply. The SASI itself is a manifestation of the process where one region of the stalled shock can go out in expense of other regions. The extra energy from neutrino heating can even revive the entire sphere. However, the energy gained by neutrino heating is limited.

A recent attempt to revive the stalled shock is that of Couch & Ott (2013), who introduced perturbations to the Si/O layers, and found them to enable shock revival under certain conditions. What Couch & Ott (2013) term a successful explosion is actually a revival of the stalled shock. They did not obtain the desired ~ 1 foe explosion. As with many other simulations, small changes in the initial conditions determine whether shock revival occurs or not. For example, Couch & Ott (2013) find shock revival when their neutrino heat factor is 1.02, but not when it is 1. They present their average shock position until it reaches a radius of 430 km at $t = 0.32$ s. Examining their successful revival run presented in their figure 3, we find the average shock outward velocity in the last part they show, 370 to 430 km, to be $\langle v_{\rm shock} \rangle = 8000 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$. This is less than 0.3 times the escape velocity at that radius. The shock does not seem to accelerate in the last 50 km. Within $\Delta t \simeq 0.04$ s the shock will reach a radius of about 700 km, where no more energy gain is possible (Janka 2001). At 400 km the neutrino optical depth is very small, $\tau < 0.1$. Indeed, at an average shock radius of 350 km the heating efficiency in their simulation η, defined as net heating rate divided by $L_{\nu_e} + L_{\bar{\nu}_e}$, drops below 0.1. This implies that the gained energy will be very small, $\Delta E < \tau L_\nu \Delta t < 0.2$ foe. We therefore estimate that even the perturbations introduced by Couch & Ott (2013) will not bring the explosion, if occurs, close to 1 foe.

Let us quantify the statement of energy close-to-zero. We can make the following estimations based on the models of Woosley et al. (2002) of massive stars prior to the collapse. The gas at 2000 km has a specific gravitational energy of $e_{G0} = -10^{18} \ {\rm erg \ g^{-1}}$ and a specific internal energy of $e_{I0} = 5.5 \times 10^{17} \ {\rm erg \ g^{-1}}$. After mass loss to neutrinos from the core, the inner mass reduces by $\sim 10\%$. However, by that time the shell that starts at few$\times 1000$ km has been accelerated inward. So we take the total specific energy to be as the pre-collapse energy. As an example, we take the stalled shock to be at $r_s = 200$ km. When reaching $r_s = 200$ km the specific total energy $e_t = e_{I0} + e_{G0}$, stays the same. The specific gravitational energy is $e_{Gs} \simeq 10 e_{G0} = -10^{19} \ {\rm erg \ g^{-1}}$, and the specific internal (thermal + kinetic+nuclear) energy, is $e_{Is} = e_t - 10 e_{G0} \simeq 9.5 \times 10^{18} \ {\rm erg \ g^{-1}}$. The net specific energy relative to gravitational energy in this demonstrative example is

$$\xi_s \equiv \left| \frac{e_t}{e_{Gs}} \right| \simeq 0.95. \tag{8}$$

The mass is very close to be unbound. Small amount of net heating can revive the shock. For a

typical mass in the gain region of $M_g \lesssim 0.05 M_\odot$ (e.g., Couch 2013), an extra energy of $\Delta E = 5 \times 10^{49}\,\mathrm{erg} = 0.05\,\mathrm{foe}$ will revive the shock.

6. ENERGY AVAILABLE FROM RECOMBINATION

Adding nuclear energy of free nucleons does not change the above property of an almost unbound stalled shock, and the conclusion of low 'explosion' energy. Consider the scenario where disintegration of nuclei form free nucleons beyond the stalled shock, and the available nuclear energy is reused later after the free nucleons are accelerated outwards by neutrinos (Janka et al. 2012). When the nucleons recombine to form heavy nuclei an energy of up to $9\,\mathrm{MeV}$ per nucleon can in principle be used to explode the star (Janka et al. 2012). A mass of $0.06 M_\odot$ in the gain region can then release in principle $\sim 10^{51}\,\mathrm{erg}$ (Scheck et al. 2006).

However, the recombination of free nucleons to alpha particles, a process that uses $7\,\mathrm{MeV}$ from the $9\,\mathrm{MeV}$ available in forming silicon, starts when the reviving post-shock gas reaches $r \sim 250\,\mathrm{km}$ (Fernández & Thompson 2009). The energy released by recombination accelerates the material (Fernández & Thompson 2009), which results in a shorter acceleration time than given in Equations (1) or (6). This further lowers the energy that can be supplied by neutrinos below that given in Equations (3) and (7).

The energy available from recombination is limited as well. From Figure 5 of Fernández & Thompson (2009), we find the total fraction of α particles in the gas inside the shock when the shock radius is $500\,\mathrm{km}$ to be $\mathrm{X}_\alpha \lesssim 0.5$; the fraction just behind the shock front at $500\,\mathrm{km}$ is $\mathrm{X}_\alpha \simeq 0.9$. In the results of Fernández & Thompson (2009) the fraction of α particles increases as the shock moves outward. For this fraction, the average energy available from recombination is 5 MeV/ nucleaon (Janka et al. 2012). However, the shock is only at $500\,\mathrm{km}$ and a large fraction of the mass is much deeper. As the shock expands further, the fraction of α particles will increase and the available energy will decrease. Taking a mass in the gain region of $M_{\rm gain} \lesssim 0.05 M_\odot$ (e.g., Couch 2013), we find the 'explosion' energy to be $E_{\rm nuc} \lesssim 0.5\,\mathrm{foe}$. In some 2D simulations the mass in the gain layer is $\gtrsim 0.05 M_\odot$, but in 3D simulations the gain layer has lower mass than in 2D simulations (e.g., Couch 2013). Over all, the available energy without neutrino winds or jets is $< 0.5\,\mathrm{foe}$. This value is an upper limit and consistent with many of the simulations summarized in Table 1 that achieve much lower energies or do not revive the shock at all.

It should be emphasized that the recombination is not a new energy source, as the thermal energy of the shocked gas is used to disintegrate the nuclei. The recombination is the re-usage of this energy. The extra energy must come from neutrinos that lift the free nucleons to larger radii. The total available energy from recombination is proportional to the mass of the free nucleons that

are lifted from small $r \lesssim 150\,\mathrm{km}$ to large radii $r \gtrsim 500\,\mathrm{km}$. However, the amount of mass that can be accumulated at small radii is limited because if the density is too high then cooling overcomes neutrino heating, and the shock will not be revive.

Yamamoto et al. (2013) preformed 1D and 2D simulations of shock revival and examined explosion energy including recombination and shock nuclear burning. They tuned the neutrino luminosity to a critical value that gives successful explosions. Their successful runs have shock relaunch times of $0.3 - 0.4\,\mathrm{s}$ in 2D flows. The explosion energy in these runs is in the range of $0.6 - 1.5\,\mathrm{foe}$. We note the following regarding their tuned calculations:
(1) Yamamoto et al. (2013) assume that neutrino heating alone revives the stalled shock. Then they can use the entire recombination energy to explode the rest of the star. The more realistic calculations of Fernández & Thompson (2009) show that at least half the recombination energy is required to help revive the shock.
(2) The above assumption implies the need for high neutrino luminosity. Indeed, in Yamamoto et al. (2013) successful 2D runs the required critical neutrino luminosities are $L_{\nu,c} = L_{\bar{\nu},c} = 4.8 \times 10^{52}\,\mathrm{erg\,s^{-1}}$ and $4.5 \times 10^{52}\,\mathrm{erg\,s^{-1}}$ for shock relaunching times of $0.3\,\mathrm{s}$ and $0.4\,\mathrm{s}$, respectively. These neutrino luminosities are $\sim 50\%$ higher than what most realistic numerical simulations find, e.g., Fischer et al. (2012), and $\sim 30\%$ higher than the neutrino luminosities obtained by Mueller et al. (2012) who included general relativistic effects. Interestingly, Mueller et al. (2012) find for their $11M_\odot$ model that recombination of nucleons and α-particles in the ejecta would provide an additional energy of $E_{\rm rec} \simeq 0.02\,\mathrm{foe}$. For their $15M_\odot$ model they argue that burning in the shock will add on the order of $0.1 - 0.2\,\mathrm{foe}$ or more.
(3) The contribution of nuclear and recombination energies to the diagnostic explosion energy of Yamamoto et al. (2013) are very similar to the contribution of neutrino heating.

Based on these points we can use a more realistic value of neutrino heating, $E_\nu < 0.2\,\mathrm{foe}$, and conclude that the combined explosion energy in realistic simulations will be $E_{\rm exp} < 0.5\,\mathrm{foe}$. Again we reach the conclusion that including recombination energy will at most bring the explosion energy to $E_{\rm exp} < 0.5\,\mathrm{foe}$. Although close to the canonical $1\,\mathrm{foe}$ value, one must keep in mind that this value is obtained with very favorable conditions, and in scaled, rather than realistic, simulations. In more realistic simulations the recombination energy is found to be $E_{\rm rec} \lesssim 0.2\,\mathrm{foe}$, e.g., Mueller et al. (2012).

7. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Using simple estimates of a spherically-symmetric mass ejection by neutrino flux in core-collapse supernovae (CCSNe), we found that in the delayed-neutrino mechanism (Bethe & Wilson 1985), where the explosion is due to neutrino heating in the gain region, the explosion energy is

limited to $E < 0.3$ foe (eq. 3 and 7). This falls short of what is required in most CCSNe.

Although our simple analytical estimates are limited to spherically symmetric outflows, they none-the-less catch the essence of the delayed-neutrino mechanism. In a non-spherical flow, instabilities, such as neutrino-driven convection and the standing accretion shock instability (SASI), play a major role (e.g., Hanke et al. 2013). Such instabilities allow inflow and outflow to occur simultaneously. Still, recent and highly sophisticated 3D simulations with enough details to resolve such instabilities, as summarized in Table 1, do not obtain enough energy to revive the stalled shock, e.g., (Janka 2013). The energy that can be used from the neutrino flux might, under favorite conditions, revive the stalled shock, but cannot lead to explosions with energies of $E_e \gtrsim 0.2$ foe.

Our conclusion holds as long as no substantially new ingredient is added to the delayed-neutrino mechanism. Such an ingredient can be a strong wind, as was applied by artificial energy deposition by Nordhaus et al. (2010, 2012). In their 2.5D simulations, Scheck et al. (2006) achieved explosion that was mainly driven by a continuous wind. The problem we see with winds is that they are less efficient than jets. Indeed, in order to obtain an explosion the winds in the simulations of Scheck et al. (2006) had to be massive. For that, in cases where they obtained energetic enough explosions the final mass of the NS was low ($M_{\rm NS} < 1.3 M_\odot$). Such a wind must be active while accretion takes place; the accretion is required to supply the energy.

The lack of persisting success, and possibly failure, of the delayed-neutrino mechanism calls for a paradigm shift. As well, the rich variety of CCSN properties (e.g., Arcavi et al. 2012) further emphasizes the need to study alternative models for CCSN explosions, some of which are based on jet-driven explosions (Janka 2012). An inflow-outflow situation naturally occurs with jets launched by accretion disks. Recent observations (e.g. Milisavljevic et al. 2013; Lopez et al. 2013) suggest that jets might play a role in at least some CCSNe. Another motivation to consider jet-driven explosion mechanisms is that jets might supply the site for the r-process (Winteler et al. 2012; Papish & Soker 2012b). The question is whether the accreted mass possesses sufficient specific angular momentum to form an accretion disk. Persistent accretion disk requires the pre-collapsing core to rotate fast, as in the magnetohydrodynamics class of models (e.g. LeBlanc & Wilson 1970; Meier et al. 1976; Bisnovatyi-Kogan et al. 1976; Khokhlov et al. 1999; MacFadyen et al. 2001; Höflich et al. 2001; Woosley & Janka 2005; Burrows et al. 2007; Couch et al. 2009, 2011; Lazzati et al. 2011). Most massive stars reach the core-collapse phase with a too slow core rotation for the magnetorotational mechanism to be significant.

One alternative to the delayed-neutrino mechanism is the so-called "jittering-jet" mechanism of Papish & Soker 2011. The jittering-jet mechanism overcomes the requirement for rapid core rotation, and was introduced as a mechanism to explode all CCSNe (Papish & Soker 2011, 2012b, 2014). The angular momentum source is the convective regions in the core (Gilkis & Soker 2014), and/or instabilities in the shocked region of the collapsing core. Blondin & Mezzacappa (2007),

Fernández (2010), and Rantsiou et al. (2011) suggested that the source of the angular momentum of pulsars is the spiral mode of the SASI. In the jittering-jet mechanism there is no need to revive the accretion shock, and it is a mechanism based on a negative feedback cycle. As long as the core was not exploded, the accretion continues. After an energy equals several times the core binding energy is deposited to the core by the jets, the star explodes. This energy amounts to ~ 1 foe. If the feedback is less efficient, more accretion is required to accumulate the required energy. If the efficiency is very low, the accreted mass onto the NS brings it to collapse to a black hole and launch relativistic jets. Namely, in general, *the less efficient the feedback mechanism is, the more violent the explosion is* (Gilkis & Soker 2014).

This research was supported by the Asher Fund for Space Research at the Technion, and a generous grant from the president of the Technion Prof. Peretz Lavie. OP is supported by the Gutwirth Fellowship. JN is supported by an NSF Astronomy and Astrophysics Postdoctoral Fellowship under award AST-1102738 and by NASA HST grant AR-12146.01-A.

REFERENCES

Arcavi, I., Gal-Yam, A., Cenko, S. B., et al. 2012, ApJ, 756, L30

Baade, W., & Zwicky, F. 1934, Physical Review, 46, 76

Bethe, H. A., & Wilson, J. R. 1985, ApJ, 295, 14

Bisnovatyi-Kogan, G. S., Popov, I. P., & Samokhin, A. A. 1976, Ap&SS, 41, 287

Blondin, J. M., Mezzacappa, A., & DeMarino, C. 2003, ApJ, 584, 971

Blondin, J. M., & Mezzacappa, A. 2007, Nature, 445, 58

Brandt, T. D., Burrows, A., Ott, C. D., & Livne, E. 2011, ApJ, 728, 8

Bruenn, S. W., Mezzacappa, A., Hix, W. R., et al. 2013, ApJ, 767, L6

Buras, R., Rampp, M., Janka, H.-T., & Kifonidis, K. 2003, Physical Review Letters, 90, 241101

Buras, R., Rampp, M., Janka, H.-T., & Kifonidis, K. 2006, A&A, 447, 1049

Buras, R., Janka, H.-T., Rampp, M., & Kifonidis, K. 2006, A&A, 457, 281

Burrows, A., & Lattimer, J. M. 1985, ApJ, 299, L19

Burrows, A., & Goshy, J. 1993, ApJ, 416, L75

Burrows, A., Hayes, J., & Fryxell, B. A. 1995, ApJ, 450, 830

Burrows, A., Dessart, L., Livne, E., Ott, C. D., & Murphy, J. 2007, ApJ, 664, 416

Colgate, S. A., & White, R. H. 1966, ApJ, 143, 626

Couch, S. M. 2013, Presented in the Fifty-one erg meeting, Raleigh, May 2013.

Couch, S. M. 2013, ApJ, 775, 35

Couch, S. M., & Ott, C. D. 2013, ApJ, 778, L7

Couch, S. M., & O'Connor, E. P. 2013, arXiv:1310.5728

Couch, S. M., Wheeler, J. C., & Milosavljević, M. 2009, ApJ, 696, 953

Couch, S. M., Pooley, D., Wheeler, J. C., & Milosavljević, M. 2011, ApJ, 727, 104

Dolence, J. C., Burrows, A., Murphy, J. W., & Nordhaus, J. 2013, ApJ, 765, 110

Fernández, R., & Thompson, C. 2009, ApJ, 703, 1464

Fernández, R. 2010, ApJ, 725, 1563

Fischer, T., Martínez-Pinedo, G., Hempel, M., & Liebendörfer, M. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 85, 083003

Fryer, C. L., & Warren, M. S. 2002, ApJ, 574, L65

Gilkis, A. & Soker, N. 2013, MNRAS, in press, arXiv1401.1597

Hanke, F., Marek, A., Müller, B., & Janka, H.-T. 2012, ApJ, 755, 138

Hanke, F., Mueller, B., Wongwathanarat, A., Marek, A., & Janka, H.-T. 2013, ApJ, 770, 66

Höflich, P., Khokhlov, A., & Wang, L. 2001, 20th Texas Symposium on relativistic astrophysics, 586, 459

Janka, H.-T., & Mueller, E. 1996, A&A, 306, 167

Janka, H.-T. 2001, A&A, 368, 527

Janka, H.-T. 2012, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science, 62, 407

Janka, H.-T. 2013, Presented in the Fifty-one erg meeting, Raleigh, May 2013.

Janka, H.-T., Hanke, F., Hüdepohl, L., et al. 2012, Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, 2012, 010000

Khokhlov, A. M., Höflich, P. A., Oran, E. S., et al. 1999, ApJ, 524, L107

Kitaura, F. S., Janka, H.-T., & Hillebrandt, W. 2006, A&A, 450, 345

Kuroda, T., Kotake, K., & Takiwaki, T. 2012, ApJ, 755, 11

Lazzati, D., Morsony, B. J., Blackwell, C. H., & Begelman, M. C. 2011, arXiv:1111.0970

LeBlanc, J. M., & Wilson, J. R. 1970, ApJ, 161, 541

Liebendörfer, M., Mezzacappa, A., Thielemann, F.-K., et al. 2001, Phys. Rev. D, 63, 103004

Liebendörfer, M., Rampp, M., Janka, H.-T., & Mezzacappa, A. 2005, ApJ, 620, 840

Lopez, L. A., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., Castro, D., & Pearson, S. 2013, ApJ, 764, 50

MacFadyen, A. I., Woosley, S. E., & Heger, A. 2001, ApJ, 550, 410

Marek, A., & Janka, H.-T. 2009, ApJ, 694, 664

Meier, D. L., Epstein, R. I., Arnett, W. D., & Schramm, D. N. 1976, ApJ, 204, 869

Mezzacappa, A., Liebendörfer, M., Messer, O. E., et al. 2001, Physical Review Letters, 86, 1935

Milisavljevic, D., Soderberg, A., Margutti, R., et al. 2013, arXiv:1304.0095

Mueller, B., Janka, H.-T., & Marek, A. 2012, ApJ, 756, 84

Mueller, B., & Janka, H.-T. 2014, arXiv:1402.3415

Nomoto, K., & Hashimoto, M. 1988, Phys. Rep., 163, 13

Nordhaus, J., Brandt, T. D., Burrows, A., Livne, E., & Ott, C. D. 2010, Phys. Rev. D, 82, 103016

Nordhaus, J., Burrows, A., Almgren, A., & Bell, J. 2010, ApJ, 720, 694

Nordhaus, J., Brandt, T., Burrows, A., & Almgren, A. 2011, MNRAS, 423, 1805

Ott, C. D., Burrows, A., Dessart, L., & Livne, E. 2008, ApJ, 685, 1069

Papish, O., & Soker, N. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 1697

Papish, O., & Soker, N. 2012a, Death of Massive Stars: Supernovae and Gamma-Ray Bursts, 279, 377

Papish, O., & Soker, N. 2012b, MNRAS, 421, 2763

Papish, O., & Soker, N. 2014, MNRAS,

Rampp, M., & Janka, H.-T. 2000, ApJ, 539, L33

Rantsiou, E., Burrows, A., Nordhaus, J., & Almgren, A. 2011, ApJ, 732, 57

Roy, R., Kumar, B., Maund, J. R., et al. 2013, arXiv:1306.5389

Scheck, L., Kifonidis, K., Janka, H.-T., Mueller, E. 2006, A&A, 457, 963

Suwa, Y. 2013, arXiv:1311.7249

Suwa, Y., Kotake, K., Takiwaki, T., et al. 2010, PASJ, 62, L49

Sawai, H., & Yamada, S. 2014, arXiv:1402.0513

Takiwaki, T., Kotake, K., & Suwa, Y. 2013, arXiv:1308.5755

Takaki, K., Kawabata, K. S., Yamanaka, M., et al. 2013, arXiv:1306.5490

Ugliano, M., Janka, H.-T., Marek, A., & Arcones, A. 2012, ApJ, 757, 69

Wilson, J. R. 1985, Numerical Astrophysics, 422

Winteler, C., Käppeli, R., Perego, A., et al. 2012, ApJ, 750, L22

Woosley, S., & Janka, T. 2005, Nature Physics, 1, 147

Woosley, S. E., Heger, A., & Weaver, T. A. 2002, Reviews of Modern Physics, 74, 1015

Yamamoto, Y., Fujimoto, S.-i., Nagakura, H., & Yamada, S. 2013, ApJ, 771, 27

Zhang, W., Howell, L., Almgren, A., et al. 2013, ApJS, 204, 7

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.

Paper	Type	D	Outcome	$t_{\rm end}(s)$
Mueller et al. (2012)	Self consistent	2D GR	$E_{\rm exp} \lesssim 0.2$ foe, $E_{\rm rec} \lesssim 0.2$ foe	0.8
Janka (2013)	Self consistent	3D	No explosion	0.35
Takiwaki et al. (2013)	diffusion source approximation scheme	3D	No explosion	> 20
Bruenn et al. (2013)	Self consistent	3D	No explosion for $25M_\odot$ success for 12,15,20$M_\odot$. Explosion energy $E_{\rm exp} \simeq 0.3 - 0.4$ foe	$0.5 - 0.8$
Couch & Ott (2013)	neutrino leakage scheme	3D	Core perturbations help shock revival	$\lesssim 0.3$
Couch & O'Connor (2013)	neutrino leakage scheme	2,3D	3D explodes less easily than 2D	< 0.5
Suwa et al. (2010)	IDSA ν scheme	2D	$E_{\rm exp} \lesssim 0.1$ foe	0.5
Suwa (2013)		2D	~ 0.1 foe	70
Couch (2013)	neutrino heating and cooling scheme	1,2,3D	3D explodes less easily than 2D	< 1.0
Hanke et al. (2013)	neutrino heating and cooling scheme	2,3D	3D explodes less easily than 2D	$\lesssim 1.0$
Ugliano et al. (2012)		1D	Assumes neutrino-mechanism is successful by scaling to SN 1987A. Total energy of $E_{\rm exp} \sim 0.1 - 2$ foe	> 20
Nordhaus et al. (2010)	neutrino heating and cooling scheme	1,2,3D	3D explodes more easily than 2D	
Dolence et al. (2013)	neutrino heating and cooling scheme	1,2,3D	3D explodes more easily than 2D	
Yamamoto et al. (2013)	Unrealistically high L_ν	2D	$E_{\rm exp} \sim 0.6 - 1.5$ foe	$\gg 1$

Table 1: Summary of recent simulations. The upper half of the Table lists "realistic" simulations, i.e., those that incorporate neutrino transport above light-bulb schemes. The lower part lists "artificial" simulations, i.e., those that use scaled or parameterized neutrino heating/cooling schemes. Nomenclature: $t_{\rm end}$ is the final time of the calculation, $\rm foe \equiv 10^{51}\,erg$, $E_{\rm rec}$ is the energy available from recombination of nucleons and α-particles, and GR stands for general relativity effects.